ACSIP
Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plan

2012-2013 ARCHIVE

Source of Funds Report

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT
313 Hwy 62 E, Salem, AR 72576

Source of Funds Report

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Total Amount Reported: $221022.42

Generated on September 16, 2014

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- $121004
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $23104
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $89500
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $8400
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services".
SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- $34800
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $4275
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.
   Priority 2: Math
   Goal: To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $19125
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.
   Priority 2: Math
   Goal: To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $8400
   Priority 1: Literacy
   Goal: To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open

response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.
   Priority 2: Math
      Goal: To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $3000
   Priority 2: Math
      Goal: To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.
SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- $65218.42
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $12286.42
   Priority 4: State Support
      Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $49932
   Priority 4: State Support
      Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $2800
   Priority 4: State Support
      Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0
   There is no data for the Source of Funds type "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".
Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $200
   Priority 4: State Support
      Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

SALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL -- $121004

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $23104
 Priority 1:   Literacy

1. 2012 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY STRANDS OF READING ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE AND OPEN-RESPONSE ITEMS. THIS INCLUDES THE COMBINED POPULATION AND THE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. ALL SALEM TEACHERS,IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOMS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS, WILL BE LOOKING AT THOSE TYPES OF QUESTIONS DURING GRADE LEVEL MEETINGS TO SEE WHAT PART OF OUR CURRICULUM NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED. 2012 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 17% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2011, 90% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students

with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.

2. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 82% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students, 14% of the students with disabilities, and 83% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 92% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

3. In 2010, 92% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 94% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 94% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2011, 95% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 95% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 96% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2012, 93% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 93% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain.

4. In 2010, 82% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 79% of the economically disadvantaged students, 25% of the students with disabilities, and 84% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-

Supporting Data:

choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 87% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students, 57% of the students with disabilities, and 88% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 28% of the students with disabilities, and 91% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

5. In 2010, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2011, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test.

6. In 2010, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2011, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster.

7. In 2010, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2011, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster.

8. The 2010 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2010 School Improvement Report. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report.

Goal	All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Benchmark	To meet the state AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 2007-2010 Combined Population: 84.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 85.7 Econ. Dis.: 81.2 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2008-2011 Combined Population: 87.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 88.8 Econ. Dis.: 84.1 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: Classroom Size Reduction.

Scientific Based Research: American Educational Research Association (Fall, 2003). Class Size: Counting Students

Can Count, 1-4. Glen E. Robinson (1990, April). Synthesis of Research on the Effects of Class Size. Educational Leadership, 80-90.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS Students will be placed in smaller classes in grades K-6 in order to improve instruction in literacy. 1 teacher's salary (1 FTE) Devon Edwards will be paid with Title II-A and 2 teacher's salaries, Lynn Maguffee and Lindsey Wiseman, at 1 FTE each will be paid with NSLA funds in 2012-2013. Efforts will be made to make sure that classes are equitable when being divided into groups and that all students are treated equally and fairly at Salem Elementary School in order to prevent any kind of discrimination. The student to teacher ratio in the grade levels using classroom reduction will be 16.1 to 1. If the funds were not used, the ratio would have been 19.1 to 1. Action Type: Equity	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $23,104.00 ACTION BUDGET: $23,104.00
Total Budget:				$23,104.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $89500

Priority 1:   Literacy

1. 2012 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY STRANDS OF READING ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE AND OPEN-RESPONSE ITEMS. THIS INCLUDES THE COMBINED POPULATION AND THE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. ALL SALEM TEACHERS,IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOMS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS, WILL BE LOOKING AT THOSE TYPES OF QUESTIONS DURING GRADE LEVEL MEETINGS TO SEE WHAT PART OF OUR CURRICULUM NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED. 2012 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 17% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2011, 90% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students

with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.

2. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 82% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students, 14% of the students with disabilities, and 83% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 92% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

3. In 2010, 92% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 94% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 94% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2011, 95% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 95% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 96% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2012, 93% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 93% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain.

4. In 2010, 82% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 79% of the economically disadvantaged students, 25% of the students with disabilities, and 84% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 87% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students, 57% of the students with disabilities, and 88% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and

Supporting Data:

the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 28% of the students with disabilities, and 91% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

5. In 2010, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2011, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test.

6. In 2010, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2011, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster.

7. In 2010, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2011, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster.

8. The 2010 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2010 School Improvement Report. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report.

Goal	All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Benchmark	To meet the state AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 2007-2010 Combined Population: 84.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 85.7 Econ. Dis.: 81.2 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2008-2011 Combined Population: 87.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 88.8 Econ. Dis.: 84.1 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: Classroom Size Reduction.
Scientific Based Research: American Educational Research Association (Fall, 2003). Class Size: Counting Students Can Count, 1-4. Glen E. Robinson (1990, April). Synthesis of Research on the Effects of Class Size. Educational Leadership, 80-90.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
COORDINATION OF FUNDS Students will be placed in smaller classes in grades K-6 in order to improve instruction in literacy. 1 teacher's salary (1 FTE) Devon Edwards	Corey Johnson	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - $89,500.00 Employee

				Salaries:
will be paid with Title II-A and 2 teacher's salaries, Lynn Maguffee and Lindsey Wiseman, at 1 FTE each will be paid with NSLA funds in 2012-2013. Efforts will be made to make sure that classes are equitable when being divided into groups and that all students are treated equally and fairly at Salem Elementary School in order to prevent any kind of discrimination. The student to teacher ratio in the grade levels using classroom reduction will be 16.1 to 1. If the funds were not used, the ratio would have been 19.1 to 1. Action Type: Equity				ACTION BUDGET: $89,500.00
Total Budget:				$89,500.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $8400

Priority 1:   Literacy

1. 2012 DATA INDICATES THAT SALEM STUDENTS SCORED LOWER IN THE PRACTICAL AND LITERARY STRANDS OF READING ON THE MULTIPLE-CHOICE AND OPEN-RESPONSE ITEMS. THIS INCLUDES THE COMBINED POPULATION AND THE STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES. ALL SALEM TEACHERS,IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOMS AND SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSROOMS, WILL BE LOOKING AT THOSE TYPES OF QUESTIONS DURING GRADE LEVEL MEETINGS TO SEE WHAT PART OF OUR CURRICULUM NEEDS TO BE ADJUSTED. 2012 RESULTS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE NEED FOR EQUAL EMPASIS ON THE CONTENT AND STYLE DOMAINS OF WRITING. TEACHERS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE CONTENT AND STYLE DURING WRITING INSTRUCTION. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 17% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2011, 90% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 3rd grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 88% of the economically disadvantaged students, 55% of the students with disabilities, and 90% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the combined population were the Writing-Style & Content domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest areas for the students with disabilities were the Writing-Style & Content domains.

2. In 2010, 88% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 83% of the economically disadvantaged students, 40% of the students with disabilities, and 89% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 82% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 75% of the economically disadvantaged students, 14% of the students with disabilities, and 83% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no

other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 4th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 85% of the economically disadvantaged students, 43% of the students with disabilities, and 92% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

Supporting Data:

3. In 2010, 92% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 94% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 94% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2011, 95% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 95% of the economically disadvantaged students, 84% of the students with disabilities, and 96% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain. In 2012, 93% of the combined population of 5th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 89% of the economically disadvantaged students, 66% of the students with disabilities, and 93% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Content multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities was the Content domain.

4. In 2010, 82% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 79% of the economically disadvantaged students, 25% of the students with disabilities, and 84% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Style domain. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2011, 87% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 80% of the economically disadvantaged students, 57% of the students with disabilities, and 88% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Content open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items. In 2012, 91% of the combined population of 6th grade students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the Benchmarks. 93% of the economically disadvantaged students, 28% of the students with disabilities, and 91% of the Caucasian students scored proficient or advanced. There were no other measurable subgroups. The lowest areas in reading for the combined population were the Reading-Literary multiple-choice items and the Reading-Practical open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the combined population was the Content and Style domains. The lowest areas in reading for the students with disabilities were the Reading-Practical multiple-choice items and the Reading-Literary open-response items. In writing, the lowest area for the students with disabilities were the multiple-choice items.

5. In 2010, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with

disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2011, 75% of the combined population of kindergarten students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Sounds & Print. 73% of the Caucasian population, 75% of the students with disabilities, and 71% of the economically disadvantaged students scored at or above the 50th percentile. The lowest Cluster average was in the Identification Cluster, averaging 78%. In 2012, Kindergarten did not test.

6. In 2010, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2011, 67% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 65% of the Caucasian students, 55% of the free/reduced students, and 48% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster. In 2012, 75.9% of the combined population of 1st grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 77.1% of the Caucasian students, 68.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. The lowest area of concern was in the Explicit Sequence, Actions Cluster.

7. In 2010, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2011, 53% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 51% of the Caucasian students, 48% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster. In 2012, 78.2% of the combined population of 2nd grade students scored at/above the 50th percentile in Reading Comprehension. 75.5% of the Caucasian students, 70.3% of the free/reduced students, and 0% of the students with IEP's scored at/above the 50th percentile. A low area of concern was the Using Monitoring Strategies Cluster.

8. The 2010 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2010 School Improvement Report. The 2011 Arkansas Adequate Yearly Progress Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2011 School Improvement Report. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objective Report identifies our attendance rate to meet the attendance goal identified by the 2012 School Improvement Report.

Goal	All students will improve in literacy skills, especially in all three strands of Reading (Literary, Content, and Practical), in both strands of Writing (Content and Style), and in Reading Comprehension.
Benchmark	To meet the state AMO requirement annually with a goal of a 1/2% increase in the total number of proficient/advanced students. 2007-2010 Combined Population: 84.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 85.7 Econ. Dis.: 81.2 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2008-2011 Combined Population: 87.8 African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: 88.8 Econ. Dis.: 84.1 LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA 2009-2012 Combined Population: African-American: NA Hispanic: NA Caucasian: Econ. Dis.: LEP: NA Stu. w. Dis.: NA

Intervention: Accelerated Reader Program.				
Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning Inc. (2002, March). Summary of Research, 1-56. Magnolia Consulting. (2010). A final report for the evaluation of Renaissance Learning's Accelerated Reader program. Charlottesville, VA: Author.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology supplies will be purchased to support all instructional programs. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Computers	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: $8,400.00 ACTION BUDGET: $8,400.00
Total Budget:				$8,400.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services".

SALEM HIGH SCHOOL -- $34800

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $4275
Priority 1:   Literacy

1. In 2012, the instructional literacy team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response content was the biggest area of concern in literacy.
2. In 2012, 71% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2012 91% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 86% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 40% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2012, 93% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 94% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2012, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the ITBS.
3. In 2011, 63% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2011 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 65% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2011, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 90% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 67% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%,

Supporting
Data:

Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2011, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

4. In 2010, 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2010 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 79% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2010, 84% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 80% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2010, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 62 percentile in Reading and 56 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 22 percentile in Reading and 8 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10. In 2010, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 on the ACT exam in English and a 20.7 in reading during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.

6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

7.

Goal	To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements anually

Intervention: Reduce class size in English.				
Scientific Based Research: Kiger, Derick M. Class Size Reduction: A Facilitator of Instructional Program Coherence, pg 1-43. Volume 7, Number 4 December, 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The grade level placement of CSR (classroom size reduction) teacher will be based upon enrollment at the beginning fo the school year. Teachers input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (April Tyree). In the eighth grade, one period of English is above the required amount of sections	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $2,604.00 ACTION BUDGET: $2,604.00

(Rachael Foster). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity					
Total Budget:					$2,604.00

Priority 2:   Math

1. In 2012, the instructional math team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response numbers and opertions for the seventh and eighth grade benchmark and open response language of algebra for the Algebra EOC and open response language of geometry for the Geometry EOC were the biggest areas of concern in math.

2. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2012, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2012, 91% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 90% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2012, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2012, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 58

percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 55 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. In 2011, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 64 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 59 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the ITBS.

3. In 2010, 89% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 84% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2010, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2010, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 34% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2010, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2010, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 70 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2010, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

4. In 2009, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%,

Supporting Data:

Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2009, 77% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. In 2009, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 79% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 29% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. In 2009, 87% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 86% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. In 2008, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 67 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2009, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 20.4 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.
6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

| Goal | To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions. |

| Benchmark | To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements annually. |

Intervention: Reduce class size in mathematics.				
Scientific Based Research: Kiger, Derick M. Class Size Reduction: A Facilitator of Instructional Program Coherence, pg 1-43. Volume 7, Number 4 December, 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

The grade level placement of CSR teachers will be based upon enrollment at the beginning of the school year. Teacher input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, the CSR improved from 27 students per teacher to 14 students per teacher. In the eighth grade, the CSR improved from 26 to 13 students per teacher. Action Type: Equity	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $1,671.00 ACTION BUDGET: $1,671.00
Total Budget:				$1,671.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $19125

Priority 1: Literacy

1. In 2012, the instructional literacy team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response content was the biggest area of concern in literacy.
2. In 2012, 71% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2012 91% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 86% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 40% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2012, 93% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 94% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2012, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the ITBS.
3. In 2011, 63% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2011 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 65% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were:

Supporting Data:

OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2011, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 90% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 67% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2011, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

4. In 2010, 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2010 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 79% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2010, 84% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 80% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2010, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 62 percentile in Reading and 56 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 22 percentile in Reading and 8 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10. In 2010, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 on the ACT exam in English and a 20.7 in reading during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.

6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

7.

Goal		To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements anually

Intervention: Reduce class size in English.				
Scientific Based Research: Kiger, Derick M. Class Size Reduction: A Facilitator of Instructional Program Coherence, pg 1-43. Volume 7, Number 4 December, 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The grade level placement of CSR (classroom size reduction) teacher will be based upon enrollment at the beginning fo	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End:	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	NSLA (State-281) - $12,444.00

the school year. Teachers input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, one period of English is above the required sections (April Tyree). In the eighth grade, one period of English is above the required amount of sections (Rachael Foster). Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration Action Type: Equity		06/30/2013	• District Staff • Teachers	Employee Salaries: ──────────── ACTION BUDGET: $12,444.00
Total Budget:				$12,444.00

Priority 2:   Math

1. In 2012, the instructional math team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response numbers and opertions for the seventh and eighth grade benchmark and open response language of algebra for the Algebra EOC and open response language of geometry for the Geometry EOC were the biggest areas of concern in math.

2. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2012, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2012, 91% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 90% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2012, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%,

Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2012, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 58 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 55 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. In 2011, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 64 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 59 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the ITBS.

Supporting Data:

3. In 2010, 89% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 84% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2010, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2010, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 34% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2010, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2010, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 70 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2010, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74

percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

4. In 2009, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2009, 77% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. In 2009, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 79% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 29% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. In 2009, 87% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 86% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. In 2008, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 67 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2009, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 20.4 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.

6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

Goal   To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements annually.

Intervention: Reduce class size in mathematics.				
Scientific Based Research: Kiger, Derick M. Class Size Reduction: A Facilitator of Instructional Program Coherence, pg 1-43. Volume 7, Number 4 December, 2002.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
The grade level placement of CSR teachers will be based upon enrollment at the beginning of the school year. Teacher input and data from several sources will be used to divide the students up into equitable classes. In the seventh grade, the CSR improved from 27 students per teacher to 14 students per teacher. In the eighth grade, the CSR improved from 26 to 13 students per teacher. Action Type: Equity	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: $6,681.00 <hr> ACTION BUDGET: $6,681.00
Total Budget:				$6,681.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $8400

Priority 1:   Literacy

1. In 2012, the instructional literacy team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response content was the biggest area of concern in literacy.
2. In 2012, 71% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2012 91% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 86% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 40% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2012, 93% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 94% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 50% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2012, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the ITBS.
3. In 2011, 63% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2011 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 65%

Supporting Data:

of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2011, 89% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 90% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 67% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2011, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 52 percentile in Reading and 48 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 37 percentile in reading and 42 percentile in Language, students with disabilities scored in the 29 percentile in Reading and 20 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the ITBS. In 2011, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

4. In 2010, 69% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 57% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Literacy (Grade 11) exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 68%, Content 78%, Practical 69%, MC; Literary 69%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 63%, Content 75%, Practical 75%, Writing MC, 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 43%, Content 50%, MC; Content 56%, Practical 56%, Writing; Multiple Choice 50%. In 2010 81% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 79% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 7th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 56%, Content 79%, Practical 70%, MC; Content 67%. In 2010, 84% of the combined students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 80% of the socio ecomonic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark, 0% of the students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the literacy portion of the 8th grade Benchmark. The lowest identified areas for the combined students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for eonomically disadvantaged students were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Literary 89%; Content 74%, Writing Multiple Choice 63%. In 2010, the combined population of seventh grade students scored in the 62 percentile in Reading and 56 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 22 percentile in Reading and 8 percentile in Comprehensive Language on the Stanford 10. In 2010, the ninth grade combined population scored in the 53 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 53 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile in Reading Comprehension and 21 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10, and socio economic deprived students scored in the 66 percentile in Reading, 74 percentile in Math, and in the 55 percentile in Language on the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 19.7 on the ACT exam in English and a 20.7 in reading during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.

6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report list the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

7.

Goal
To improve reading comprehension and writing skills across the curriculum. Focus areas will be open response, writing content and style, and reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements anually

Intervention: Continue To Use Accelerated Reader Program
Scientific Based Research: Renaissance Learning, Inc., March 2002, Summary of Research. p. 1-56.
Person

Actions	Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds	
Technology supplies will be purchased along with toner to support educational programs within the high school. Action Type: Technology Inclusion Action Type: Title I Schoolwide	Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Computers	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies:	$8,400.00
				ACTION BUDGET:	$8,400.00
Total Budget:					$8,400.00

Priority 2:   Math

1. In 2012, the instructional math team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response numbers and opertions for the seventh and eighth grade benchmark and open response language of algebra for the Algebra EOC and open response language of geometry for the Geometry EOC were the biggest areas of concern in math.

2. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2012, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2012, 91% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 90% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2012, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement

39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2012, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 58 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 55 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. In 2011, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 64 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 59 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the ITBS.

Supporting Data:

3. In 2010, 89% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 84% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2010, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2010, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 34% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2010, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2010, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 70 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2010, the

combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

4. In 2009, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2009, 77% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. In 2009, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 79% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 29% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. In 2009, 87% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 86% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. In 2008, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 67 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2009, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 20.4 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.

6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

Goal

To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements annually.

Intervention: Align math curriculum to the Arkansas Frameworks and common core state standards.				
Scientific Based Research: Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs: Getting Results with Curriculum Mapping. (2004) p. 1-181				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Common core state standard binders will continue to be used to assist teachers in implementing the common core state standards. Action Type: Alignment	Shaun Windsor, Technology Coordinator	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Teachers • Teaching Aids	NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies: $0.00 ACTION BUDGET: $0.00
Total Budget:				$0.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $3000
 Priority 2:   Math

1. In 2012, the instructional math team for the high school found that the data indicated that open response numbers and opertions for the seventh and eighth grade benchmark and open response language of algebra for the Algebra EOC and open response language of geometry for the Geometry EOC were the biggest areas of concern in math.
2. In 2012, 76% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 69% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2012, 81% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 80% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2012, 91% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 90% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of

Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2012, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2012, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 58 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 55 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. In 2011, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 64 percentile in total math, students with low socio-economic status scored in the 59 percentile, students with disabilities scored in the 24 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the ITBS.

3. In 2010, 89% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 84% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 41%, Algebra 38%, Geometry 35%, Measurement 71%, Data Analysis and Probability 36% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2010, 84% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 0% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. The lowest identified areas students with disabilites were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 44%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 31%, Data Analasis and Probability 48%, MC; Number and Operations 55%, Algebra 69%, Geometry 59%, Measurement 66%, Data Analysis and Probability 58%. In 2010, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 34% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 35%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 39%, Linear Functions 53%, Non-Linear Functions 36%, Data Interpretation and Probability 55%, MC; Language of Algebra 72%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 76%, Linear Functions 78%, Data Interpretation and Probability 76%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 38%, Linear Functions 50%, Non-Linear Functions 38%, Data Interpretation and Probability 50%, MC; Language of Algebra 67%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 75%, Linear Functions 75%, Data Interpretation and Probability 75%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 13%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 13%, Linear Functions 38%, Non-Linear Functions 13%, Data Interpretation and Probability 38%, MC; Language of Algebra 50%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 58%, Linear Functions 58%, Data Interpretation and Probability 41%. In 2010, 82% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 67% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry

Supporting Data:

82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 34%, Triangles 30%, Measurement 39%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 54%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 31% MC; Language of Geometry 82%, Triangles 76%, Measurement 70%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 79%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 66%. In 2010, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 70 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2010, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

4. In 2009, 85% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 78% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 7th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for combined population students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for socio economic deprived students were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Numbers and Operations 13%, Algebra 34%, Geometry 39%, Measurement 44%, Data Analysis and Probability 60% MC; Algebra 57%. In 2009, 77% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 75% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam, 50% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Math portion of the 8th grade Benchmark Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Number and Operations 43%, Algebra 33%, Geometry 28%, Measurement 40%, Data Analasis and Probability 63%, MC; Number and Operations 54%, Algebra 58%, Geometry 52%, Measurement 61%, Data Analysis and Probability 54%. In 2009, 80% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 79% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam, 29% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Algebra End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. The lowest identified areas for students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Algebra 25%, Solve Equations and Inequalities 56%, Linear Functions 36%, Non-Linear Functions 31%, Data Interpretation and Probability 54%, MC; Language of Algebra 68%, Solving Equations and Inequalities 71%, Linear Functions 71%, Data Interpretation and Probability 66%. In 2009, 87% of combined students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 86% of socio economic deprived students scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam, 33% of students with disabilities scored proficient or advanced on the Geometry End of Course Exam. The lowest identified areas for the combined population were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the socio-economic deprived students were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%, Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. The lowest identified areas for the students with disabilities were: OR; Language of Geometry 58%, Triangles 53%, Measurement 74%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 41%. Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 46% MC; Language of Geometry 74%, Triangles 73%, Measurement 78%, Relationships between two and three Dimensions 66%,

Coordinate Geometry and Transformations 68%. In 2008, the combined seventh grade population scored in the 67 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 27 percentile. In 2009, the combined ninth grade population scored in the 75 percentile in total math, students with disabilities scored in the 48 percentile. Economically disadvantaged students scored in the 74 percentile on the math portion of the Stanford 10.

5. Students have scored an average of 20.4 in mathematics on the ACT exam during the 2010, 2011, and 2012 school years.
6. The 2012 Arkansas Annual Measurable Objectives Report lists the Salem High School graduation rate (98.15) as meeting the state standard.

Goal To improve students' mathematics problem-solving skills and ability to respond to open-response items. Focus areas will be measurement, number sense/operations, and open response questions.

Benchmark To meet the state Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) requirements annually.

Intervention: To improve mathematics curriculum by continuing to teach the Transition to College Mathematics course, College Algebra, and College Trigonometry;				
Scientific Based Research: High School Curriculum Vol.1, No. 1, August-September 2001.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Salem schools will purchase one ACT exam through the VUAA for each junior. Students will take the exam in April. Action Type: Alignment Action Type: Collaboration	Wayne Guiltner, Principal	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office • District Staff • Teachers	NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: $3,000.00 ACTION BUDGET: $3,000.00
Total Budget:				$3,000.00

SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT -- $65218.42

Source of Funds

For: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits, NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries, NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies, NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects, NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services.

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay -- $0
There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Capital Outlay".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits -- $12286.42
Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:
1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2011-12 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students
2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2010-11 school-year.
3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.

Goal To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

Benchmark To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2012- 13, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999).

Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Funds will be used as an incentive to increase salaries above the minimum salary schedule. The Salem School District has used NSLA funds in this manner since the inception of NSLA funding. The district is in compliance with state law that requires a yearly 20% reduction in funds used for salaries above the minimum until no more than 20% of NSLA funds are used for this expenditure. The district has received approval from the commissioner of education to use funds in this manner as required by law. The Salem School District uses funds to increase salary above the minimum to ensure that we can attract highly qualified teachers to teach in our district. A quality teacher in the classroom is the most important commodity the district can purchase to ensure student success. Teachers that receive salary above the minimum through NSLA are: Melodye Aldridge, Kara Boyd, David Cone, Linda DuBois, Cassie Knight, Denise Fowler.	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $6,620.00 ACTION BUDGET: $6,620.00
A technology coordinator (0.5 FTE)will be employed to provide instruction, training, and support for all academic technology initiatives. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		NSLA (State-281) - Employee Benefits: $5,666.42 ACTION BUDGET: $5,666.42
Total Budget:				$12,286.42

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries -- $49932

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:	1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2011-12 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2010-11 school-year. 3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.
Goal	To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Benchmark	To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2012- 13, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Funds will be used as an incentive to increase salaries above the minimum salary schedule. The Salem School District has used NSLA funds in this manner since the inception of NSLA funding. The district is in compliance with state law that requires a yearly 20% reduction in funds used for salaries above the minimum until no more than 20% of NSLA funds are used for this expenditure. The district has received approval from the commissioner of education to use funds in this manner as required by law. The Salem School District uses funds to increase salary above the minimum to ensure that we can attract highly qualified teachers to teach in our district. A quality teacher in the classroom is the most important commodity the district can purchase to ensure student success. Teachers that receive salary above the minimum through NSLA are: Melodye Aldridge, Kara Boyd, David Cone, Linda DuBois, Cassie Knight, Denise Fowler.	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013	• Administrative Staff • Central Office	NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: $28,800.00 ACTION BUDGET: $28,800.00
A technology coordinator (0.5 FTE)will be employed to provide instruction, training, and support for all academic technology initiatives. Action Type: Professional Development Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Ken Rich	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		NSLA (State-281) - Employee Salaries: $21,132.00 ACTION BUDGET: $21,132.00
Total Budget:				$49,932.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies -- $2800

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:	1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2011-12 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students 2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2010-11 school-year. 3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.
Goal	To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.
Benchmark	To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2012- 13, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding				
Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5.				
Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds

Technology supplies, software, and materials will be purchased to support instructional programs and infrastructure within the district. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies:	$400.00
				ACTION BUDGET:	$400.00
A rackmount KVM console will be purchased to manage and coordinate all school servers. This equipment will allow the district to more efficiently manage school-wide literacy programs. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		NSLA (State-281) - Materials & Supplies:	$2,400.00
				ACTION BUDGET:	$2,400.00
Total Budget:					$2,800.00

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects -- $0

There is no data for the Source of Funds "NSLA (State-281) - Other Objects".

Source of Funds: NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services -- $200

Priority 4: State Support

Supporting Data:
1. 1.Data from the professional development needs survey indicated the following as a priority for the 2011-12 school year: 1. Implementing the Common Core 2. Implementing the use of high order thinking skills in classroom instruction 3. Instructional strategies that engage students
2. 2. The Salem Alternative School graduated two (2) students during the 2010-11 school-year.
3. 3. 100% of teachers at Salem Schools are highly qualified as required by No Child Left Behind. The Arkansas Department of Education approved NSLA funds to be used for the purpose of paying teachers above the minimum salary schedule.

Goal: To improve academic achievement and school environment for all students, including students that are considered from a low socio-economic background.

Benchmark: To meet state AYP targets and to improve secondary indicators. Salem Schools will provide the resources and professional development necessary to maintain current levels of student achievement. Our district will strive to improve instruction to reach all students and help them succeed. In 2012- 13, teachers will continue to emphasize methods to attack open-response items in mathematics and literacy. There will also be an emphasis on project-based learning and ensuring that students are learning all state frameworks and common core state standards to a deeper level. Teachers will be implementing the use of many different instructional technology devices/programs into student lessons to provide visual examples and strategies to students and to bring in electronic resources to our students.

| Intervention: National School Lunch Act Funding |
| Scientific Based Research: National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment (1999). Reducing Class Size, What Do We Know, 1-11. Janelle Young (2003). The Examination of Low Socioeconomic Students and Effective Educational Motivational Strategies, 1-5. |

Actions	Person Responsible	Timeline	Resources	Source of Funds
Technology supplies, software, and materials will be purchased to support instructional programs and infrastructure within the district. Action Type: Technology Inclusion	Shaun Windsor	Start: 07/01/2012 End: 06/30/2013		NSLA (State-281) - Purchased Services: $200.00
				ACTION BUDGET: $200.00
Total Budget:				$200.00